



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,119	06/26/2003	Kenneth Alexander Vadella	G&C 30566.243-US-U1	5589
55895	7590	12/13/2010	EXAMINER	
GATES & COOPER LLP			ANYA, CHARLES E	
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER				
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,119	VADELLA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHARLES E. ANYA	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,522,343 B2 issued to Sobeski et al. in view of Platform SDK: COM IGlobalInterfaceTable (hereinafter referred to as IGlobalInterfaceTable pages 1-2).**

4. As to claim 1, Sobeski teaches a computer-implemented method for enabling communication between disconnected applications, comprising:

(a) a secondary application (Java Windowed environment 210) creating a document that is configured to host a disconnected application (“...Java (second) object acts as a container, to the site the COM-type object...” Col. 2 Ln. 7 – 12, “...creation of Java objects...” Col. 5 Ln. 3 – 67, Col. 6 Ln. 3 – 5), wherein:

(i) the disconnected application is disconnected from the secondary application (“...Java object 214 “wrap” the COM-type object 212 so that the object 212 may be used within the Java windowed environment 210...” Col. 5 Ln. 46 – 51, Look-Table 216 Col. 48 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 52 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 52 – 55);

(ii) the disconnected application is unaware of the secondary application (“...Java object 214 “wrap” the COM-type object 212 so that the object 212 may be used within the Java windowed environment 210...” Col. 5 Ln. 46 – 51, Look-Table 216 Col. 48 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 52 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 52 – 55); and

(iii) the secondary application is unaware of the disconnected application (“...Java object 214 “wrap” the COM-type object 212 so that the object 212 may be used within the Java windowed environment 210...” Col. 5 Ln. 46 – 51, Look-Table 216 Col. 48 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 52 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 52 – 55);

(b) the secondary application further creating, when the secondary application creates the document, a bridge object, wherein: (Step 302 Col. 7 Ln. 61 - 67),

(i) an interface for the bridge object enables communication from the secondary application to the disconnected application through the bridge object (Look-Table 216 Col. 48 – 67, “...the look-up table maps the interfaces and attributes...” Col. 7 Ln. 61 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 52 – 55); and

(ii) the interface enables communication from the disconnected application to the secondary application through the bridge object (Look-Table 216 Col. 48 – 67, “...the look-up table maps the interfaces and attributes...” Col. 7 Ln. 61 – 67, Col. 8 Ln. 52 – 55.

Sobeski is silent with reference to:

(c) registering the interface for the bridge object in a global interface table (GIT);

(d) retrieving a cookie from the GIT in response to the registration, wherein:

(i) the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object; and

(ii) utilizing the interface enables the disconnected application to be isolated from specifics of how communication with the secondary application is accomplished; and

(e) storing the cookie in a location that is accessible to the disconnected application and to the secondary application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface by the disconnected application and the secondary application.

IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches (c) registering the interface for the bridge object in a global interface table (GIT) (“Register...” page 1 lines 5 and 37-38, “...register...” page 2 line 5);

(d) retrieving a cookie from the GIT in response to the registration, wherein:

(i) the cookie comprises information for utilizing the interface for the bridge object (“...a cookie...” page 2 line 6, “...get a cookie...” page 2 line 5); and

(ii) utilizing the interface enables the disconnected application to be isolated from specifics of how communication with the secondary application is accomplished (“...IGlobalInterfaceTable Allows any apartment in a process to get

Art Unit: 2194

access to an interface implemented on an object in any other apartment..." page 1 lines 1 – 10) and

(e) storing the cookie in a location that is accessible to the disconnected application and to the secondary application such that the cookie may be retrieved to enable use of the interface by the disconnected application and the secondary application ("...GetInterfacefaceFromglobal method...this cookie..." page 1 lines 39 – 41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sobeski with the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable would improve the system of Sobeski by providing a mechanism for getting a cookie that could be used instead of passing the actual pointer (whenever you need to pass the pointer), either to a non-method parameter that is going to another apartment or to in-process memory accessible outside your apartment because using the cookie provides complete thread-safe functionality.

5. As to claim 2, Sobeski teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the secondary application comprises a project hosting environment (Java Windowed environment 210).

6. As to claim 3, Sobeski teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the disconnected application comprises an ActiveX control (ActiveX Col. 1 Ln. 45 – 46, Col. 5 Ln. 20 – 25 Col. 7 Ln. 49 – 52).

7. As to claim 4, IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the registering of the interface for the bridge object in the GIT comprises placing a pointer to the interface for the bridge object in the GIT (“...an interface pointer...” page 1 lines 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sobeski with the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable would improve the system of Sobeski by providing a mechanism for getting a cookie that could be used instead of passing the actual pointer (whenever you need to pass the pointer), either to a non-method parameter that is going to another apartment or to in-process memory accessible outside your apartment because using the cookie provides complete thread-safe functionality.

8. As to claim 5, IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the cookie identifies the pointer and a location of the interface (“...identifies...” page 1 line 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sobeski with the teaching of

IGlobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable would improve the system of Sobeski by providing a mechanism for getting a cookie that could be used instead of passing the actual pointer (whenever you need to pass the pointer), either to a non-method parameter that is going to another apartment or to in-process memory accessible outside your apartment because using the cookie provides complete thread-safe functionality.

9. As to claim 6, IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: the disconnected application extracting the cookie from the location; the disconnected application accessing the cookie to enable use of the interface for the bridge object; and the disconnected application communicating with the secondary application using the interface for the bridge object (“...GetInterfaceFromGlobal method...” page 1 lines 40 – 41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sobeski with the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable would improve the system of Sobeski by providing a mechanism for getting a cookie that could be used instead of passing the actual pointer (whenever you need to pass the pointer), either to a non-method parameter that is going to another apartment or to in-process memory accessible outside your apartment because using the cookie provides complete thread-safe functionality.

10. As to claims 7 and 13, see the rejection of claim 1 above.
11. As to claims 8 and 14, see the rejection of claim 2 above.
12. As to claims 9 and 15, see the rejection of claim 3 above.
13. As to claims 10-12, see the rejection of claims 4-6 respectively.
14. As to claims 16-18, see the rejection of claims 4-6 respectively.
15. As to claim 19, IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the location comprises an environment variable (“...pointer...location...” page 1 lines 38 – 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sobeski with the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable would improve the system of Sobeski by providing a mechanism for getting a cookie that could be used instead of passing the actual pointer (whenever you need to pass the pointer), either to a non-method parameter that is going to another apartment or to in-process memory accessible outside your apartment because using the cookie provides complete thread-safe functionality.

16. As to claim 20, IGlobalInterfaceTable teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the secondary application and application are executing within a same process but in different apartments (“...in the process...” page 1 lines 3 – 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sobeski with the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable because the teaching of IGlobalInterfaceTable would improve the system of Sobeski by providing a mechanism for getting a cookie that could be used instead of passing the actual pointer (whenever you need to pass the pointer), either to a non-method parameter that is going to another apartment or to in-process memory accessible outside your apartment because using the cookie provides complete thread-safe functionality.

17. As to claims 21-24, see the rejection of claims 19 and 20 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLES E. ANYA whose telephone number is (571)272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Charles E Anya/
Examiner, Art Unit 2194

cea.